

Markey	Pastor	Slaughter
Martinez	Payne (NJ)	Spratt
Mascara	Payne (VA)	Stark
Matsui	Pelosi	Stokes
McCarthy	Peterson (FL)	Studds
McDermott	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
McHale	Pickett	Tanner
McKinney	Pomeroy	Taylor (MS)
McNulty	Poshard	Tejeda
Meehan	Rahall	Thompson
Meek	Rangel	Thornton
Menendez	Reed	Thurman
Miller (CA)	Richardson	Torres
Minge	Rivers	Torricelli
Mink	Roemer	Towns
Moakley	Rose	Vento
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Moran	Rush	Volkmer
Murtha	Sabo	Ward
Nadler	Sanders	Waters
Neal	Sawyer	Watt (NC)
Oberstar	Schroeder	Waxman
Obey	Schumer	Williams
Olver	Scott	Wise
Ortiz	Serrano	Woolsey
Orton	Sisisky	Wyden
Owens	Skaggs	Wynn
Pallone	Skelton	Yates

NOT VOTING—16

Ballenger	Johnston	Velazquez
Brown (OH)	McInnis	White
Franks (NJ)	Mfume	Whitfield
Gallely	Schiff	Wilson
Hayes	Stockman	
Hostettler	Tucker	

□ 1317

Mr. DIXON and Mr. McNULTY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules and pursuant to House Resolution 297, I call up House Resolution 301 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 301

Resolved. That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the further conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996 and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is their objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the floor today this rule providing for the consideration of the further conference report on H.R. 1977, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. This is a simple, fair rule which waives all points of order against the conference report, and against its consideration.

The blanket waiver includes a waiver of clause 2 of rule XX, as well as a waiver of clause 3 of rule XXVIII, which will permit the House to discuss provisions which may exceed the scope of differences between the House and the Senate.

Under the normal rules of the House, we will have one hour of debate on the conference report itself, in addition to the minority's traditional right to offer a motion to recommend, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, despite recent press reports to the contrary, we are making progress toward completing our work on the thirteen regular appropriations bills. Seven of the thirteen bills have thus far been enacted into law, and passing this bill, and this rule today will bring us one step closer to our goal of balancing the Federal budget and avoiding any unnecessary shutdown of the Federal Government.

Clearly, the task of finishing all of the spending bills on time has not been easy, and the Interior appropriations bill is certainly no exception. Issues related to the development and stewardship of America's natural resources often spark great controversy, as we have seen with regard to mining patents and the management of national forests with this particular piece of legislation.

But, under the leadership of my friend and colleague from Ohio, Mr. REGULA, who is the distinguished chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, the conferees have reached a new and hopefully final agreement on these two very sensitive issues.

First, the conference report continues the existing moratorium on issuing mining patents, and there is no trigger that would cancel the moratorium. Any repeal would be contained in separate mining law reform legislation. In addition, the conference agreement extends the schedule for processing grandfathered applications from 2 to 5 years.

Second, with regard to the Tongass National Forest, it is my understanding that the conference agreement actually lowers the annual harvest ceiling in the forest's current management plan, and maintains the size of the current timber base for 2 years.

I would also add, Mr. Speaker, that in response to the administration's request, conferees restored a significant amount of funding for Indian-related programs. The conference agreement restores a total of \$137 million to these programs, which is \$27 million above the administration's request.

Other than these modifications, the conference report is essentially unchanged. It still provides funding for the core programs and missions of the agencies covered by this legislation, including funding to operate the Na-

tional Park System and all of our public lands, and for the health care and education needs of native Americans.

Overall, total spending in this year's conference agreement is more than one billion dollars less than the amount provided in last year's legislation. That is the fiscally responsible thing to do, and I commend Chairman REGULA and members of the Appropriations Committee for crafting a bill that honors our commitment to the American people to achieving meaningful deficit reduction and a limited, but effective Federal Government.

In closing Mr. Speaker, I believe it is only fair and proper that we do everything we can to move the budget and appropriations process forward—not only to keep the Government up and running, but to give future generations of Americans the kind of financial stability and economic prosperity that can only come from a balanced Federal budget.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 301 is the customary rule granted by the Rules Committee this year for conference reports on general appropriations bills, and it is entirely appropriate for this debate. The Rules Committee reported this rule by unanimous voice vote earlier today. I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule and to pass the conference report without any further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we oppose this rule and the measure it makes in order, the conference report on Interior appropriations for fiscal year 1996. As Members know, this is the third time this conference report has been brought to the House floor. Our good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], has our greatest respect for the difficult and time-consuming process he has had to endure from the beginning with this bill, but unfortunately, this legislation remains highly objectionable to many of us. Although the new conference report finally extends the moratorium on processing new mining patents for the duration of the fiscal year, as the House has called for through repeated votes, it contains questionable provisions for processing some 370 claims that had reached a certain stage in the patenting process.

On the other issue the conferees were specifically directed to address, the Tongass National Forest, the conference report clearly fails to respond to the House's direction. The new provision would increase timber harvests from an average 315 million board feet annually to 418 million board feet, which is the same amount that would have occurred under the previous version of this legislation.

The rule before us waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. One major reason why the conference report needs such a rule is that it contains numerous violations of clause 2 of rule XXI, the rule that prohibits legislation, that is, policy matters, in an appropriations bill. We acknowledge

that it is very difficult to avoid violating rule XXI entirely in an appropriations bill, but the Committee on Rules usually tries, or we did try, at least, in previous Congresses to minimize the extent to which appropriations bills contain policy matters. Not only did those efforts prevent flagrant intrusions on the jurisdiction of the authorizing committees, but they also kept appropriations bills from getting bogged down in disagreements over issues that are unrelated to the amount of funding being provided to government agencies.

This rule, however, sanctions the use of the appropriations process to make far-reaching changes in policies governing the use of our Nation's resources. It makes it possible for the House to consider a bill that the Los Angeles Times has said is "swollen with hidden attacks on the public lands, national parks, and the environment."

Many egregious provisions that were contained in the original conference report remain in the new version. For example, the conference report removes the Mojave preserve in California from the protection of the National Park Service by prohibiting the Park Service from spending more than \$1 on it in 1996. New report language accompanying the conference report allows the National Park Service to use a half million dollars to develop a management plan for the east Mohave area which is an increase over the second version of the conference report, but the legislation itself would still shift authority for the area back to the Bureau of Land Management, whose rules are much more lenient than are the Park Service's on mining, grazing, dirt biking, and other potentially detrimental activities.

It prohibits adding new species of plants and animals to the Endangered Species Act list, despite clear scientific evidence that hundreds of species awaiting listing are headed toward extinction. It cripples a joint Forest Service-BLM ecosystem management project for the Columbia River Basin in the Northwest, a project that was intended to allow a sustainable flow of timber from that region. This provision threatens the protection of salmon and other critical species and guarantees continued court battles over logging in that region. It places a moratorium on the development of Federal energy efficiency standards, and it delays implementation of the Interior Department's new grazing regulations.

In addition, this latest version adds a brandnew provision waiving certain environmental laws to expedite the construction of a telescope and supporting infrastructure on Mount Graham on the Coronado National Forest in Arizona, a site that contains rare and valuable ecological resources.

In addition to all these troubling provisions, the conference report endangers resource protection by reducing spending for many critical activities.

The conference report cuts spending on the Interior Department and related agencies as a whole by 10 percent from this year's level, but within that reduction are much more severe cuts in many valuable programs, including wildlife protection, energy conservation, land acquisition, support for the arts and humanities, and support for native Americans, despite the modest increase in the new version for that issue.

Mr. Speaker, these are programs that do an enormous amount of good for our Nation for a relatively small sum, and they ought to be sustained at adequate levels. These are also programs that are strongly supported by the American people. I recently sent a survey to my own constituents asking them to choose what they would cut from a list of virtually everything the Federal Government spends money on.

In response, and there were about 20,000 voters in our area who responded, and even though they wanted us to cut spending in many other areas, a full 87 percent, Mr. Speaker, 87 percent of the respondents opposed cutting spending on national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges. Eighty percent opposed cutting spending on environmental protection, 78 percent opposed cutting energy conservation and other energy research programs, and 59 percent opposed cutting Federal support for the arts and humanities. I have little doubt that if the same questions were asked almost anywhere else in the country, the results would be close to the ones that I received.

Defenders of these cuts, Mr. Speaker, say they are necessary to help balance the budget, but in fact, the \$1.4 billion cut this bill makes from last year's level of spending is necessary only in the sense that the majority's budget plan needs it to help pay for the defense appropriations bill's additional \$7 billion in spending that Pentagon officials themselves say they do not want or need.

□ 1330

It is necessary only because the majority's budget plan needs it to help pay for a 7-year, \$245 billion tax cut that the vast majority of Americans believe should not be provided until the Federal budget is actually balanced.

The real significance of this legislation is not its contribution to reducing the Federal budget deficit but rather its contribution to the comprehensive assault on environmental protection that has been launched by the Republican leadership in the House. When this legislation is viewed in the context of other antienvironmental measures the House has already passed, its negative impacts are even more apparent.

This conference report follows House passage of several so-called regulatory reform bills, the Contract With America bills that would cripple Federal regulatory agencies' ability to implement and enforce environmental protection laws.

It follows House passage of the amendments to the Clean Water Act that would permit more water pollution and allow the destruction of more than half the Nation's remaining wetlands.

It follows enactment of a provision included in the fiscal 1995 rescission bill which already has dramatically increased logging in national forests.

It follows House passage of an appropriations bill that cuts funding dramatically for the Environmental Protection Agency.

It follows House passage of the budget reconciliation bill that would open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas drilling, and would provide special deals for industries that want to use the natural resources that belong to all Americans—mining, ranching, timber, and oil and gas interests—and special deals for concessionaires in our national parks.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat, the conference report this rule makes in order is severely flawed. It fails to provide the necessary funding and safeguards for our Nation's natural resources that the American people overwhelmingly want us to provide.

I urge Members to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. And, Mr. Speaker, every single Member of this House who voted for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget should oppose this rule.

Now is the time for Members who voted to balance the budget, no matter what the cost no matter how painful, to show that they mean what they say. Now is the time for my Republican colleagues to show that they can live within their own budget.

Because, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a budget buster. This bill will cost \$21 million more than my Republican colleagues said this country could afford. It is \$21 million over budget and \$21 million over the 602b allocation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the RECORD that never, in the history of Democratic control of the House did we waive the 602b requirement on an appropriations conference report. Every single one of our appropriations conference reports stayed well within its limits. I wonder why my Republican colleagues cannot do the same and I wonder how on Earth they can vote for this rule.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule. If you voted to balance the budget, now is your chance to do so.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to

the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I want to congratulate him upon a magnificent and accurate statement of what this bill contains and why it should be defeated.

But I rise, Mr. Speaker, to read from a book review that appeared in the Washington Post last August on a book that is entitled "The Making of a Conservative Environmentalist":

In 1992, an American-Canadian agency charged with overseeing the health of the Great Lakes surprised the White House, never mind governors in 8 States bordering the lakes, by making a radical proposal. Convinced that the toxic by-products of chlorine-based industrial compounds were harming wildlife and perhaps poisoning people, the panel called for phasing out one of the basic chemical feedstocks of modern manufacturing straight elemental chlorine.

One might assume that the man behind such a noble gambit was a learned statesman and veteran environmentalist. Hardly. The recommendation's main champion was Gordon K. Durnil, the panel's American chairman, a Rush Limbaugh-loving conservative Republican from Indiana.

Here was a plain, middle-aged guy who freely admits that before being appointed by George Bush in 1989 to the International Joint Commission, a little-known but influential oversight agency that watches the Great Lakes—

He had done little. Those last few words are mine, but I go back to the quote.

In fact, Mr. Durnil acknowledges in "The Making of a Conservative Environmentalist" that he possessed absolutely no qualifications for one of the continent's senior environmental posts, other than having served as Republican Party chairman in Indiana and cultivated a close political friendship with former Vice President Dan Quayle.

How could such a naif advance one of the single boldest environmental policy ideas of the 1990s? The answer, we are told, is a simple tale of personal discovery. A Midwestern party operative late in life suddenly awakens to find truth in the popular concern for the safety of the earth. The message is that someone as conventional and as conservative as Mr. Durnil can latch on to one of the great social transformations of the American century, then so can every other Republican in the country.

The fact that they have not, particularly this year when Republican leaders in the House and the Senate are desperately trying to unravel 25 years of environmental regulation, has Mr. Durnil in a gentlemanly lather—

And so forth. It continues.

The reason I read that, of course, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that Mr. Durnil would have been very much upset by the attack that our bill makes upon the natural resources of our country.

A third more of our ancient forests are being cut in this bill than were authorized for cutting in the previous bill. The Indian people have not received the kind of funding that they should have received, in spite of the fact that additional funds were made available in the last session of the conference committee. Environmental damage is being done to our forests, to

our streams, to our parks, to every other natural resource.

I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that the rule be defeated, and if the rule is not defeated, that the bill then be defeated.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I might say that Mr. Durnil could very well come from Ohio as well as from Indiana.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, a lot of conservative environmentalists come from Ohio.

Mr. YATES. That is true. I wonder why they are not on the committee.

Mr. REGULA. I think one of them chairs it.

Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued by the gentleman from Massachusetts complaining that we are spending too much money. It is the new math that we have in Washington, DC, as near as I can figure out, since this bill is \$1.3 billion less than in 1995. It is about a 10-percent reduction from 1995 funding. It is responsive to the movement to a balanced budget.

We have had to make tough decisions, of course. But as I have said previously, we divided the responsibilities into three parts: The must-do's, the need-to-do's, and the nice-to-do's.

The must-do's we took care of. We kept the parks at level funding, the forests at level funding and operations. The Smithsonian, the National Gallery, the Kennedy Center, the things that the people enjoy, that they want to use, are nearly level-funded.

Certainly, in order to save \$1.3 billion, we had to eliminate or substantially downsize some other activities. But I simply point out again that in terms of the budget and the deficit reduction which I think the American people very much want to see, this bill is extremely responsible. I do not think that in any way it is environmentally detrimental.

It responds to the motion to recommend. We have made adjustments on the mining issue of the moratorium. We have made adjustments on Tongass. All the parties involved and both sides worked on the language, and I will address that more in the general debate.

On the matter of the Indians, we have added \$50 million, \$25 million for health services, \$25 million for tribal priorities. In fact, this is more than the administration requested. They wanted something like \$125 million over the Senate level. We are at about \$111 million over the Senate level.

So I think we have a very responsible bill here. I hope that the Members will support the rule, I hope that the Members will support the bill, and that the administration will sign it.

There are 130,000 employees that are directly affected by this bill, and what

a great gift we could give them by passing this excellent, responsible bill that has been developed with a lot of give-and-take, so that those 130,000 employees would know on Friday that their jobs would be secure, that they can go out and open the gates to the parks, to the forests, to the Smithsonian, to the fish and wildlife facilities.

If Members are concerned about the environment, the way to support the environmental issues is to vote for this bill so the funding will be available to these dedicated people who do truly take care of the environment as they provide the services in the Department of the Interior, to the cultural institutions, to the Department of Energy.

I would strongly urge the Members to support the rule and support the bill. I think, given the restraints that we had on the funding levels, that we have done a responsible job of meeting the needs of this Nation.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of the House needs to know that if you vote for this rule today and if you vote for this bill today, you will be voting to bust the budget.

Just a week ago, on December 5, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] filed on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations the Report on Budget Allocations Between Subcommittees as required by 602 of the Budget Act. That act sets the ceiling above which no appropriation bill may go without being subjected to being knocked off the floor by a point of order lodged by any Member.

Yet 1 week after they did that, and just a few short days before we are going to confront the need for a continuing resolution, or else see the Government shut down because the Speaker of the House is still at this point talking about using the leverage of the continuing resolution to force settlement of the overall budget issues, in the long-range budget talks that are now taking place, after being told that that is important enough to shut the Government down to get to a balanced budget, we are being asked to pass a proposition here today which busts the budget.

□ 1345

The filing by the committee on December 5 indicated that the ceiling for spending in this bill would be \$12,213,000,000 in budget authority. The ceiling reported in this bill, 8 days later, is \$12,234,476,000. That means it is \$21.5 million above the allowable ceiling.

Now, we tried on three different occasions to get the committee to adopt a different 602 allocation to make room for additional funding in this and other bills. We were turned down by the majority in the committee, and yet today

we are being asked to put that limitation aside.

I would ask Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, how many times do you remember having the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] come to the House floor and berate the then majority Democratic Party for waiving budget rules when they brought rules to the floor under which appropriation bills would be debated? The answer is time and time and time again we were told by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and many others that we were waiving the Budget Act. Now, today, we are being asked not only to waive the Budget Act, but to waive spending ceilings within that budget.

If you take a look at the history of this House on regular appropriation bills, you will find that it has been a rare experience, indeed, when we were asked on a regular appropriation bill to waive those ceilings. It just seems to me that when we are facing a situation which may lead again to a Government shutdown, it is a very odd thing, indeed, for the committee to ask us to bust the budget ceiling to the tune of \$21.5 billion. I do not think that is the orderly way to proceed. A much better way to proceed would have been to adjust those 602 allocations so that we are behaving as we are supposed to behave in a situation like this.

I also make the point this rule will allow us to proceed to consideration of a bill which allows for a significant increase in timber cutting in the Tongass Forest, one of a handful of temperate rain forests in the entire world, and yet this bill is going to accelerate that cutting. I do not believe we ought to do that. I do not think most persons concerned with preserving the environment think we ought to do that, certainly not in this appropriation bill.

So I would urge both on environmental grounds and because this bill breaks the very budget ceilings which were imposed on us just 8 days ago by the majority party, I would urge Members to vote "no" on the rule.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to my friend from Wisconsin who, throughout this last year, has been complaining that we have not been spending enough money on one program or another, on babies, on children, on old people, on Indians. The gentleman from Illinois sitting over there wants to help the Indians. In fact, the administration wanted to help the Indians, too. They wanted at the outset of the conference \$110 million above the Senate level to help the Indians.

This bill provides, I think, \$137 million for the Indians above the Senate

level. This bill provides more than the administration asked for them, and still the administration is threatening to veto it because now they still say there is not enough money for the Indians.

The gentleman from Illinois is opposing it because there is not enough money for the Indians. The gentleman from Wisconsin has opposed this bill because we are not spending enough money. He is not here arguing against the bill. He is just saying, well, we technically exceeded our budget allocations. Well, we did, in trying to accommodate his side, in trying to accommodate his administration, and we can cure the technicality, we can rearrange the budget allocations. In fact, we are in the process of working on that, and that is a technical glitch, and technically we are in error.

But do not say that we are not spending enough money and then attack us because we spent too much money. It does not make sense. But that is the position of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, that is not the position of the gentleman from Wisconsin. The position of the gentleman from Wisconsin is that if we have budget ceilings, we ought to live by them. But in my view, as you know, I tried twice or three times in the committee to try to adjust those ceilings in the proper way so that we could get that money from another place. I do not believe in busting the budget in order to fund the Interior bill. What I do believe is bills that are too high should be brought down to make room for the spending in this bill. I do not believe in spending \$7 billion more than the White House asked on the military budget and then also exceeding the spending authority in this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows the Defense budget has been enacted into law. I think it called for spending about \$400 million less than we spent last year, even though the administration wanted \$700 million less than we appropriated, and he still wanted to send the troops to Bosnia. But the Defense bill is not before us.

The gentleman is technically correct. I concede the gentleman's technical assertion. He is absolutely technically correct, but substantively we are giving him more money than he asked for in the first place. This is a ridiculous objection.

I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the Interior appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1996. One of the main reasons for my opposition is the severe cuts to the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. For a modest investment of \$162 million, the preservation of our cultural resources outweigh the small cost to the government each year.

Recently, this Republican Congress proposed the elimination of Federal funding for these institutions. The purpose of these agencies is to provide support for arts organizations. In turn, these groups offer the community many activities such as plays, festivals, and seminars that cannot occur without Federal assistance. Furthermore, no arts organizations receive grants from the NEA or the NEH without providing matching funds.

On July 17, the House voted to approve the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriations bill which cut Federal funding to the National Endowment for the Arts by 40 percent, leaving only \$99 million. There were three amendments to the bill which would have cut all funding to the endowment and thus, completely phase out the agency at the end of this year. Fortunately, bipartisan efforts defeated the amendments.

However, in this era of Federal budget constraints, every Federal program, whether it is worthy or not, is subject to cuts. While we must work toward a balanced budget, we must not make indiscriminate and arbitrary cuts in the NEA budget. Recently, Chairman Jane Alexander has had to implement a 47 percent reduction of staff. Because of these reductions, the number of applications will have to be significantly cut and viable arts organizations will be hurt.

During my tenure in the California legislature, I continually met with business leaders who supported the arts. I believe that support for the arts is essential and contributes to our economic edge. The same hands that mold clay or play the piano can also program computers and start new businesses. It is our creativity which must be nurtured from an early age. We cannot afford to abolish the NEA and the NEH. It is an investment in our future.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 852]

YEAS—231

Allard	Barton	Bonilla
Archer	Bass	Bono
Armey	Bateman	Brownback
Bachus	Bereuter	Bryant (TN)
Baker (CA)	Bilbray	Bunn
Baker (LA)	Bilirakis	Bunning
Ballenger	Bliley	Burr
Barr	Blute	Burton
Barrett (NE)	Boehlert	Callahan
Bartlett	Boehner	Calvert

Camp	Hayworth	Paxon
Canady	Hefley	Petri
Castle	Heinemann	Pombo
Chabot	Herger	Porter
Chambliss	Hilleary	Portman
Chenoweth	Hobson	Pryce
Christensen	Hoekstra	Quillen
Chrysler	Hoke	Quinn
Clinger	Horn	Radanovich
Coble	Hostettler	Ramstad
Coburn	Houghton	Regula
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Riggs
Combest	Hutchinson	Roberts
Cooley	Hyde	Rogers
Cox	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Crane	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Crapo	Johnson (CT)	Roth
Cremeans	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
Cubin	Jones	Royce
Cunningham	Kasich	Salmon
Davis	Kelly	Sanford
Deal	Kim	Saxton
DeLay	King	Scarborough
Diaz-Balart	Kingston	Schaefer
Doolittle	Klug	Schiff
Dornan	Knollenberg	Seastrand
Dreier	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	LaHood	Shadegg
Dunn	Largent	Shaw
Ehlers	Latham	Shays
Ehrlich	LaTourette	Shuster
Emerson	Laughlin	Skeen
English	Lazio	Smith (MI)
Ensign	Leach	Smith (TX)
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Smith (WA)
Ewing	Lewis (KY)	Solomon
Fawell	Lightfoot	Souder
Fields (TX)	Linder	Spence
Flanagan	Livingston	Stearns
Foley	LoBiondo	Stockman
Forbes	Longley	Stump
Fowler	Lucas	Talent
Fox	Manzullo	Tate
Franks (CT)	Martini	Taylor (NC)
Franks (NJ)	McCollum	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Thornberry
Frisa	McDade	Tiahrt
Funderburk	McHugh	Torkildsen
Gallegly	McIntosh	Traficant
Ganske	McKeon	Upton
Gekas	Metcalf	Vucanovich
Gilchrest	Meyers	Waldholtz
Gillmor	Mica	Walker
Gilman	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Goodlatte	Molinari	Wamp
Goodling	Moorhead	Watts (OK)
Gordon	Morella	Weldon (FL)
Goss	Myers	Weldon (PA)
Graham	Myrick	Weller
Greenwood	Nethercutt	White
Gunderson	Neumann	Whitfield
Gutknecht	Ney	Wicker
Hancock	Norwood	Wolf
Hansen	Nussle	Young (AK)
Hastert	Oxley	Young (FL)
Hastings (WA)	Packard	Zeliff
Hayes	Parker	Zimmer

NAYS—188

Abercrombie	Conyers	Frost
Ackerman	Costello	Furse
Andrews	Coyne	Gejdenson
Baesler	Cramer	Gephardt
Baldacci	Danner	Geren
Barcia	de la Garza	Gibbons
Barrett (WI)	DeFazio	Gonzalez
Becerra	DeLauro	Green
Beilenson	Dellums	Gutierrez
Bentsen	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Berman	Dicks	Hall (TX)
Bevill	Dingell	Hamilton
Bishop	Dixon	Harman
Bonior	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Borski	Dooley	Hefner
Boucher	Doyle	Hilliard
Browder	Durbin	Hinchey
Brown (CA)	Edwards	Holden
Brown (FL)	Engel	Hoyer
Bryant (TX)	Eshoo	Jackson-Lee
Cardin	Evans	Jacobs
Chapman	Farr	Jefferson
Clay	Fattah	Johnson (SD)
Clayton	Fazio	Johnson, E. B.
Clement	Fields (LA)	Johnston
Clyburn	Filner	Kanjorski
Coleman	Flake	Kaptur
Collins (IL)	Foglietta	Kennedy (MA)
Collins (MI)	Ford	Kennedy (RI)
Condit	Frank (MA)	Kennelly

Kildee	Nadler	Serrano
Klecza	Neal	Skaggs
Klink	Oberstar	Skelton
LaFalce	Obey	Slaughter
Lantos	Olver	Spratt
Levin	Ortiz	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Orton	Stenholm
Lincoln	Owens	Stokes
Lipinski	Pallone	Studds
Lofgren	Pastor	Stupak
Lowe	Payne (NJ)	Tanner
Luther	Payne (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Maloney	Pelosi	Tejeda
Manton	Peterson (FL)	Thompson
Markey	Peterson (MN)	Thornton
Martinez	Pickett	Thurman
Mascara	Pomeroy	Torres
Matsui	Poshard	Torricelli
McCarthy	Rahall	Towns
McDermott	Rangel	Vento
McHale	Reed	Visclosky
McKinney	Richardson	Volkmmer
McNulty	Rivers	Ward
Meahan	Roemer	Waters
Meek	Rose	Watt (NC)
Miller (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
Minge	Rush	Williams
Mink	Sabo	Wise
Moakley	Sanders	Woolsey
Mollohan	Sawyer	Wyden
Montgomery	Schroeder	Wynn
Moran	Schumer	Yates
Murtha	Scott	

NOT VOTING—13

Brewster	Menendez	Tucker
Brown (OH)	Mfume	Velazquez
Buyer	Sisisky	Wilson
Dickey	Smith (NJ)	
McInnis	Tauzin	

□ 1413

Mr. ORTIZ changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1745, UTAH PUBLIC LANDS MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1995

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-404) on the resolution (H. Res. 303) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1745) to designate certain public lands in the State of Utah as wilderness, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1415

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 301, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 301, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 12, 1995 at page H14288.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this is the conference report on Interior. As my colleagues know, it was recommitment once on the question of the moratorium on mining, and the second time on the mining issue and also on the Tongass timber program.

Mr. Speaker, the questions on mining and the Tongass, I will address, but let me say at the outset I think what we have is a very fair bill. For example, we had dozens and dozens of requests from Members for various things that might impact in their districts, and the number on the Democratic side that we responded to is actually a few more than on the Republican side. We made an effort to respond on the merits of the issues without regard to partisanship, and I would hope that my colleagues on the minority side would support this legislation. I think likewise that the majority Members should do the same, and I think, as I explain what we made in the way of changes, that my colleagues will understand we have responded to the concerns of the Members.

Also I think it is very important that we get this bill down to the President, and I would hope he would sign it. There are 130,000 employees who are waiting and hoping that this legislation will become law so they can get on with the job of managing the parks, keeping the gates open for the public to enjoy these wonderful facilities; likewise in managing our forests, our public lands, the grazing lands, the fish and wildlife facilities, the Smithsonian, the National Gallery. Many of my colleagues probably had their visitors here experience the fact that the doors were closed on the Smithsonian, the National Gallery, the Kennedy Center during the period of time, the 5 days or so, that we did not have funding, and, if we can get this conference report passed in the House and the Senate, get it to the President, I think to examine the merits of the bill, that the executive branch, the President, will recognize that we have been as fair as possible, that we have addressed the problems.

I want to say also at the outset that there is some talk about a budgetbuster. That has got to be the new math in this town, because this bill is \$1.3 billion under 1995 in budget authority. It